



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,498	06/26/2003	Clifford D. Bennett	DBZ / 467P2	5227

26875 7590 07/27/2005
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

A, PHI DIEU TRAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,498

Applicant(s)

BENNETT ET AL.

Examiner

Phi D. A

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16,17 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,16,17,19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3637

1. PRODUCT BY PROCESS CLAIM:

“ The subject matter present is regarded as a product by process claim in which a product is introduced by the method in which it is made. It is the general practice of this office to examine the final product described regardless of the method provided by the applicant.”

The limitation of “ injection molded” is a product by process limitation and thus treated according to the office policy set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10-13, 16, 17, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haslem et al (6089522).

Haslem et al (figure 5) shows a chair comprising a body including an upper receiving area and a lower base, the receiving area including at least two pairs of notches (the notches at top, the pairs are perpendicular to each other), the two pairs of diametrically opposed notches having different depths (the chair showing notches with different depths), the chair being adapted to support reinforcement members at different heights and in perpendicular relationship to one another, the base adapted to rest on a planar support surface, the body having an inner surface and an outer surface, the surfaces being substantially complementary to each other to allow a plurality of chairs to be stacked within one another for storage and shipment (inherently so per the tapering of the body of the structures), a plurality of ribs(24) on the outer surface and extending outwardly from an outer profile of the body to facilitate separating individual chairs

Art Unit: 3637

from a stack (inherently capable of doing so), the base including a plurality of support legs extending downwardly from the receiving area and defining a plurality of apertures (the apertures formed by legs 102, 40, 34), the apertures operable to allow poured concrete to pass fluidly through the body, the base including four support legs (34, 32), two of the support legs further including foot members (66) extending horizontally outwardly therefrom, the foot extending diagonally opposite support legs, the support legs include a thickened band of material around the apertures, the base including upper and lower support legs, the upper support legs extending downwardly from the receiving area and defining upper apertures, the lower support legs extending downwardly from the upper support legs and defining lower apertures, the lower support legs being longer than the upper support legs, the lower support legs include a thickened band of material (36) around the lower apertures, the apertures are arch-shaped, the chair is made of polypropylene (col 8 line 6), the body being generally funnel shaped with the lower opening being larger than the receiving area, the inner and outer surfaces being substantially complementary to each other, the first pair of notches being deeper than the second pair of notches.

Haslem et al does not disclose the hollow body being a unitary, integrally formed including an upper receiving area and a lower base.

Haslem et al further discloses that a body made be made as a unitary, single component, or the body may be constructed from various components which are fastened together by any known means.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haslem et al's structure to show the hollow body being a unitary, integrally

Art Unit: 3637

formed including an upper receiving area and a lower base because it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make a structure from multiple pieces into a single or vice versa as taught by Haslem et al, and it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art, Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 US 164 (1893).

3. Claims 4, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haslem et al in view of Sotelo et al (6732484).

Haslem et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the notches being connected by bridges, the bridges connecting the troughs of the notches.

Sotelo et al shows bridges (34, 32) connecting notches (42, 40) at the troughs thereof to reinforce the structure.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haslem et al's modified structure to show the notches being connected by bridges, the bridges connecting the troughs of the notches because it would reinforce the notches against the weights of the rebars as taught by Sotelo et al.

4. Claims 6-7, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haslem et al.

Haslem et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the remaining legs lacking a foot member.

Haslem et al further discloses that the body may be without the feet (col 7 line 28).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haslem et al's modified structure to show the remaining legs lacking a foot

Art Unit: 3637

member because having the remaining legs lacking a foot member would enable the legs to support the body at a tight location where there is insufficient space for the foot, and a designer of ordinary skill in the art would find such a change obvious to compensate for different location requirements.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haslem et al in view of Hartzheim (5729949).

Haslem et al as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for notches having bearing surfaces extending inwardly from the outer surface of the support body.

Hartzheim discloses notches having bearing surfaces extending inwardly from the outer surface of the support body and that such configurations would allow the chair to support a greater weight than if the radius of curvature of the legs are the same as the central opening.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haslem et al's modified structure to show the notches having bearing surfaces extending inwardly from the outer surface of the support body because such a configuration would enable the notches and chair body to support a greater weight than if the radius of curvature of the legs are the same as the central opening.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-13, 16, 17, 19-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to applicant statement that Haslem does not show the notches being formed at different depths in the receiving area, examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in figure 5,

Art Unit: 3637

the top of portion of part 100 has pairs of notches at different depths. The argument is thus moot.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Haslem does not show a plurality of ribs on an outer surface of the body, examiner respectfully disagrees. Haslem et al shows a plurality of ribs (24) on an outer surface of the body. the ribs inherently is capable of facilitating separations of chairs from a stack. The argument is thus moot.

Applicant's arguments in the 103 rejections are moot in view of the statements above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phi D A whose telephone number is 571-272-6864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

Art Unit: 3637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phi Dieu Tran A

7/24/05